

AN ANTIDOTE

FOR

A POISONOUS COMBINATION

RECENTLY PREPARED BY A "CITIZEN OF NEW-YORK,"

ALIAS DR. REESE,

ENTITLED,

"AN APPEAL TO THE REASON AND RELIGION OF
AMERICAN CHRISTIANS," &c.

ALSO,

DAVID MEREDITH REESE'S "HUMBUGS"

DISSECTED, BY

DAVID RUGGLES,

AUTHOR OF "THE EXTINGUISHER EXTINGUISHED," &c.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM STUART,
No. 108 NASSAU-STREET.
1838.

PRICE \$9 PER HUNDRED,—12½ CENTS SINGLE.

AN ANTIDOTE, &c.

A PAMPHLET has lately been issued, entitled "An appeal to the reason and religion of American Christians against the American Anti-Slavery Society, by a Citizen of New-York." This pamphlet, charged with scurrility, abuse, and falsehood, is, I suspect, an emanation from my old friend Dr. Reese. I may be pardoned this surmise when I declare that the thing is so like him, that it is either his own or a counterfeit;—and who would counterfeit Dr. Reese? In short, this pamphlet contains Dr. Reese's thoughts, many of his precise words and expressions—his style, manner, virulence, sophistry, and falsehood. If he will come forward and deny that he wrote the pamphlet, I may recall this public disclosure of my suspicions, but claim the liberty still to think as I please, for denials have been made before in regard to writing pamphlets, etc., etc.

My object in coming again before the public, is to neutralize any bad effect, which the pamphlet referred to may have upon the community. I know it carries its own antidote in many particulars, yet society is so constituted, and the relations of life are so complex and various, that a thousand circumstances concur to give probability to falsehood, and currency to error. The public mind is but the counterpart of common fame, and answers well the description of the poet, as tenacious of falsehood as of truth—as greedy of scandal as of good tidings. There is a class in society whom such effusions as that now under discussion will prejudice to their injury. They are those who think little for themselves, have not time or inclination to study and investigate truth, and who are consequently unable at once to detect the shallowness and sophistry contained in such writings. They are the unwary, the unsteady, the vacillating or the deeply prejudiced and biased reader. I have no fears for those who can bring a tolerable understanding to the perusal of that pamphlet, with honesty and candor. It is extremely shallow, unspeakably low and abusive, and so illogical and absurd in its pretended arguments as to remind the reader forcibly, that the author was exemplifying the words of the poet which he quotes,

"Whom God wishes to destroy he first makes insane."

Why the author did not subscribe his name to this publication may be owing to the fact that he wots of me. Even his mania for notoriety had not the temerity to challenge his proper antagonist. Great sacrifice! but vain hope. Did I not spy him in his covert? Is not the tree known by its fruit, and the beast by its track? No child looks so much like its father as this pamphlet resembles Dr. Reese.

The Appeal, so called, commences with a solemn protest against the American Anti-Slavery Society, charging it with vices greater

than all the vices, and a potency to do evil, stronger, incomparably, than all the evil influences else that infest the world. "It is," says the author, "the prolific parent of the most gigantic mischiefs, and patriotism and christianity demand its extinction."

I shall not attempt to do justice to the author in his straight-jacket discourse about the hideous wickedness of the American Anti-Slavery Society and its members, but proceed directly to refute some of his objections, and remove some of his scandals.

The author republishes the old falsehood forty-nine times told, that things were going on very well towards emancipation until the Anti-Slavery Society came in like a mighty head wind, and drove them back some thirty, some sixty, some an hundred years. "Let it be remembered," says the author, "that the entire North have for many years been avowedly opposed to slavery in the South without any *known exception* either in public or private life." Strange that this united opposition to Slavery in the South had never manifested itself! The truth is, there was such a general accordance of the North with Southern slavery, that none seemed to question its sinlessness, and consequently things went on smoothly, the North believing that the South would emancipate her slaves when it was convenient. Before entering into the merits of the subject, our author declares that the "principles of the American Anti-Slavery Society are fundamentally erroneous." [A recent discovery!] "And the results of those principles thus far carried out, already threaten the overthrow of liberty, law, and religion, &c."

Thus it appears the sage discovery has at last been made, that if men will love their neighbors as themselves, they will overthrow liberty, law, and religion; and a system having the word of God and the first law of nature for its basis becomes, *therefore*, the "abomination of desolation" spoken of by—David.

Now if our author can only succeed in convincing the world that these things are just as he says they are, what then? Why then, "this done, the cause of human rights and universal emancipation being rescued from the faction who have jeopardized the hopes of freedom, &c., &c., will rally round it men of wiser heads and better hearts, who cannot, dare not, participate in the violent and anti-christian spirit of modern abolitionism." No citizen of the North, who is at all acquainted with the anti-slavery effort can read the above extract without a smile. Is the man crazy? Does he hope yet to delude the community into the belief, contrary to their senses, that abolitionists are rash, violent, or anti-christian—that they have injured the cause of freedom, or that they lack among them men wise in head and good in heart? What consummate nonsense! Why, the cause of abolitionism embraces now, I am bold to hazard the assertion, a majority of the piety, if not the talent of our whole country. And when the writer of a scurrilous pamphlet calls the wisdom or piety of this Society in question, it only excites my ridicule. But I pass on to notice the manner in which he proves that the principles of the American Anti-Slavery Society are fundamentally erroneous.

"It declares," says he, "slaveholding to be a heinous crime in the

sight of God," &c. But, "the honorable William Jay affirms, that the first great principle of the Society, and the one from which all the others are adduced, is the sinfulness of *slavery*. He, however, blunders here, as he frequently does in his labored inquiries," [none of these blunders ever appeared from Dr. R.'s attempt to answer Judge Jay,] "for the constitution declares, not that slavery is sinful, but that slaveholding is such." What a pity the Dr. had not discovered the difference in meaning between these two words sooner; perhaps he intends the Appeal as a supplement to the defunct Jay revived. But seriously, here is a great difficulty!—here is the term *slavery* used instead of the term *slaveholding*, but which is the proper term to use lies between our author and the American Anti-Slavery Society. I shall adhere to the term used by the A. S. Society—*slaveholding*—and I do so for sake of perspicuity.

The term *slavery* is a comprehensive word, embracing the slaveholder and the slave, with all the several places and relations of superiors, inferiors, and equals, from generation to generation. That part of *slavery* which is constituted by the relation of the slave, I cannot call sinful on the part of the slave. So with every relation and appendage of *slavery*, they all, when guilt or sin is the question, roll off the responsibility, and the responsibility is still rolled on till it lodges upon the agent, the free agent in the matter, and he is the slaveholder. Thus I contend, that the terms *slaveholding* and *slavery* are synonymous terms, when the question concerns their morality. Abstractly considered there is a wide difference.

Says the author, "We especially direct attention to the fact that the accusation of 'heinous crime' is made against the *slaveholding*, and not against *slavery*; as a system."

Now I perceive nothing extraordinary in this distinction. Most writer suse the terms synonymously; and although there is a difference in the words which I have endeavored to explain, yet common use is higher authority than strict etymological or metaphysical analysis. I repeat that *slavery*, when considered in a moral point of view, is seen to be invested with guilt which implies an agent, or agents. But the only agent of guilt in the case is the *slaveholder*,—hence *slavery* can never be considered guilty or sinful unless the *slaveholder* is so also. What effort has been made to conceal and avoid the "obvious distinction" between these terms I know not; certain that every weapon directed against *slavery* must go through the conscience of the slaveholder; nor can I perceive any motive for "concealment." On the contrary, *slavery*, being the more general term, an attack may be made upon it at less cost, and less exposure to the censure of captious reviewers. The framers of the Anti-Slavery constitution verily believed this system of *slavery* "to be wrong, but they would have merited small thanks for such a declaration, nor hardly have distinguished themselves in this from slave drivers, for they (at that time) said as much. The system is wrong every one will admit, but the *slaveholders*—the men who fabricate the system, sustain it, and breathe into it the breath of living death—they, forsooth, must not, in a moral point of view, be brought into connection or comparison with

the system—certainly not! they are the very antipodes of the very system which they themselves originate, nourish, cherish, and adore! Why, only think of it, “to make the accusation of ‘heinous crime’ against *slaveholding* and not against *slavery as a system*,” is monstrous! Now what is to come of all this? Why, to be sure, nothing less than to make slaveholding “robbery, piracy, and man-stealing!” And to this proposition our author demurs; he says, “it is not true,” and proceeds to “demonstrate,” as he says, “to all men of reason that this first great principle is absolutely false.” As our author’s demonstrations, however, frequently lack one leg of the triangle, or one link of the chain, I must be permitted to follow him to see that he does no violence to the rules of logic.

He proceeds, as he says, “to lay down the three following propositions, together with examples in illustration of each.”

“PROP. I. The act of slaveholding is not ‘*heinous*’ crime, nor can it be in any sense sinful when it is *involuntary and unavoidable*.”

Here our writer very modestly assumes the question in dispute. The American Anti-Slavery Society contends that slaveholding is *always voluntary and avoidable*, and never yet has been guilty of so great folly as is here represented, and which must have had its source from an origin whence the American Anti-Slavery Society did not derive their principles. “Proposition 1st” is pretty safe ground. I knock under. What is “involuntary and unavoidable” absolutely, irresistibly and by fate decreed, predestinarian as I am, I cannot think it “in any sense sinful,” so far as I am concerned. But a thought occurs to my mind,—may not the system itself be wrong, whilst I the innocent, guiltless perpetrator, and actor out of the system, may be as actively serving God and my country as when performing any commanded duty? I must suspend my judgment till I follow out the argument—hear the author: “This must be admitted by all, that where the master is constrained to hold his slave by any power which he can neither overcome nor avoid, however much he may desire to do so, his retaining his fellow-men in bondage under such circumstances is *not sin*.” This reasoning has just claim to regard in one respect, that is, it is sticking close to the text. Other words for the proposition itself. The author is safely enough entrenched here—he has a strong hold, and he seems a little afraid to get out of it. He proceeds: “To deny this proposition is to maintain that the law of God requires an impossibility, and that the volition, motive, or intention is not a constituent in moral action.” True, every word true. He reasons like a book. But here comes the conclusion, the “*hence*” of the matter: “Hence,” says he, “it follows, that a man may be a sinner although the act which constitutes him such, is the result of irresistible necessity.*

* I wish it to be noted that the conclusion here arrived at, although ironical, and attempted to be palmed off on the American Anti-Slavery Society, is the very one to which the author legitimately arrives from Propositions 2d and 3d, for he contends in these propositions, that certain acts of slaveholding are *involuntary and unavoidable*. If therefore I can show, either that under these

Such is the monstrous absurdity which results from the dogma of the American Anti-Slavery Society, that slaveholding is sin, independent of all circumstances, and immediate abolition is duty irrespective of all consequences."

Now who ever heard of applying a conclusion in the manner above? *Such* is the monstrous absurdity, &c! *Such*? What is the absurdity? That a man is constituted a sinner (we are speaking now of slaveholding sinners) by the mere workings of an irresistible necessity. True conclusion. But why apply the absurdity to the American Anti-Slavery Society? Why not, with the same propriety, to the Board of Foreign Missions or the North-West Fur Company? The author has not advanced a single argument in favor of the proposition. Nor were that necessary, as it is undeniable; but he should have made it appear that the proposition is a doctrine of the American Anti-Slavery Society, or a principle of its constitution, which he has not done, neither can he do. That paragraph of the Constitution which he quotes as most favorable to his purpose, reads thus: "Every American Citizen who retains a human being in involuntary bondage, is, *according to Scripture*, a MANSTEALER."

Now there is a vast difference between this language and "Proposition 1," of the Appeal,—a difference as wide as from East to West, perfectly at poles. And when the American Anti-Slavery Society declares that "slaveholding is sin independent of all circumstances," it is upon the assumed fact that slaveholding is always *voluntary and avoidable*.

The illustrations under this proposition, do clearly enough evince the proposition, provided they be *true*; but as they are in the same predicament with the proposition itself, they must be rejected for the same reason. In neither of the illustrations is there a particle of proof or probability that the slaveholders mentioned are placed in circumstances which compel them to continue such, contrary to their own CHOICE. A man is not *compelled* by law to be an executor, or the guardian of orphan children, and if he can be neither without a violation of principle, he ought not to *choose* the office.

If the laws of any state actually prohibit emancipation, let the slaveholder remember that he has a *choice* still; to obey God rather than man is I know an obsolete doctrine in certain quarters where expediency has mounted the throne; it is notwithstanding a doctrine of divine warrant, and stronger by infinite than any state enactment. No law *can* compel a man to hold slaves, or prohibit him in such a manner, as to take away the liberty of will and leave him guiltless in doing what God condemns; for Christians ought to remember if they have forgotten, or learn, if they never have known, that they *are at liberty to suffer* for righteousness' sake, and this privilege no despotic inflection of law can take away—they ought to learn the power and efficiency of suffering, and how much depends upon it, in the economy

circumstances slaveholding is wrong, or that there is an error in the premises of Proposition 1, I will have shown that our author goes the whole for the doctrine that a man may be a "sinner" from "*irresistible necessity*."

of grace and providence. But I will not wander. The illustrations may as well be adduced to prove that assassination is not murder. But hear: "An infant child born to a mother who is a slave under either of the circumstances named, and who dies in giving birth to her offspring, becomes by law the slave of the owner of the mother, whose duty is to rear it as such, and the relation of slaveholder to this infant slave is involuntary, and 'immediate abolition,' in such a case would be brutality." I have introduced this quotation at length to show what shifts a man will resort to when he is in need and hard beset. It is of a piece with what has already been discussed. The writer pertinaciously clings to the privilege of *assuming* the question in dispute, and fails to bring forward a single argument in favor of his position. An example may illustrate a proposition, when it does not exemplify the truth or explain principles. So do the two examples under consideration illustrate "Proposition I.;" for the simple reason that both *assume* the same ground. The quotation above, grounded, as it would appear, upon the examples depends altogether for its validity and veracity upon the soundness of the proposition itself, and the examples by which it is illustrated. All these we have seen to be mere naked assumptions. Let me guard the reader against mistaking my meaning. I say "Proposition I." is a mere assumption; not that I deny its truth, for it is strictly true, in itself considered, but it assumes in the argument, that the American Anti-Slavery Society teaches the doctrine that an *act* may be sinful although it be *involuntary and unavoidable*. A doctrine nowhere taught in the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

The language of our author's first "proposition," deserves a passing comment. He makes the ACT involuntary and unavoidable! What is an *act*? Does it not imply volition, will, choice, effort—*action*? But our sapient moralist, concludes it to be a mere physical operation, set in motion by some like physical agent. Now a child born to the female slave of a master, becomes his property of necessity! his relation to it is involuntary!! Blasphemous nonsense! execrable, infamous doctrine!

The author concludes this proposition, by saying: "In all these and similar cases—and they exist in many thousands—the act of slaveholding is not sinful, because involuntary." Here is one of the author's "non sequiturs," for which he is famous. His whole argument reduced to a syllogism will stand thus:

"Whatever is involuntary and unavoidable is not sinful;
Slaveholding is involuntary and unavoidable;
Therefore, Slaveholding is not sinful."

Neither of the propositions here has been proved. The reasoning and illustrations of the author are alike fallacious. I grant the major proposition to be true; but the minor one is false, and the conclusion of course false. The syllogism is perfect, but the facts in the case must be proven.

Thus our author has tugged in vain to prove in the first place what no one denies, viz., that an act is not sinful when involuntary and unavoidable; and secondly, he has labored with great zeal and vehemence

to fix the charge of denying this proposition, and acting upon a contrary one, upon the American Anti-Slavery Society. In both instances he has entirely failed. Now let us keep his object in view. It is no less than to prove that the first great principle of the society "is absolutely false." What is this first great principle? Why, says our author, "The honorable William Jay affirms, the great principle of the Society, and the one from which all the others are adduced, is the sinfulness of slavery." But our author says, that Mr. Jay blunders here, as he does frequently in his labored inquiry, for the constitution declares, not that slavery is sinful, but that slaveholding is such," &c. Well, Mr. Jay and the Society have used different words synonymously perhaps, and this I have considered already; but it happens that our sage author derives his proposition not from any thing contained in the constitution of the Society, nor even in Mr. Jay's comment upon it; but quotes two or three sentences from the first Annual Report of the Society, and from these quotations doth, as he asserts, deduce the following as the "first great principle of the Society;" viz., "Every American Citizen who holds a slave (as property!!) under any circumstances, is guilty in the sight of God, of the heinous crime of robbery, piracy, and manstealing." I have no objection to the foregoing sentiment, but I object to the manner in which it has been brought in. It is not worth while to open a full battery upon a publication so insignificant, and an author so despicable, or I would show that each of the quotations from which his deductions are made, are strictly, philosophically, and really true; and I would prove by direct argument, drawn from reason, revelation, and common sense, that slaveholding is always wrong, and the slaveholder a manstealer. But this I am not called upon to do; it is capable of being done, and has been done a thousand times. My object at this time is to refute the charges against the American Anti-Slavery Society, and this I have done. I therefore proceed to "Proposition II."

'PROP. II. The act of slaveholding is *not* sin when emancipation would be necessarily CRUEL AND INHUMAN.'

"To deny this proposition," our author declares, "is to maintain that cruelty and inhumanity towards our fellow creatures is required by the law of God." As an illustration he gives the example of "aged, decrepit, insane, blind, deaf and dumb, or idiotic servants."

Here the proposition, as usual, assumes what it has no right to, viz., that cruelty and inhumanity are ever connected by *necessity* with emancipation. This is a question first to be settled before it be made the premises. And why is it cruel or inhuman to *break every yoke*? The examples adduced do not touch the point; they refer to the forcible *exclusion* of slaves, not to their emancipation at all. The law of the land can never be the arbiter or keeper of a slaveholder's conscience, if he have a conscience, and is withal *so humane and feeling*. But I will not multiply words. It remains for the author of the Appeal to prove that emancipation is in any instance necessarily cruel and inhuman.

"PROP. III. Slaveholding is not sin when the act of emancipation would be

attended with the **FORCIBLE** separation of husbands from wives, and parents from children against their will, their remonstrances, and their tears."

This proposition must strike the reader at once as an absurdity. What, the very system that causes separation of husbands from wives and the sundering of all the dearest ties of life—that fills the land with tears and groans and lamentations, is this system to be continued because, if it be abolished, the evils which it causes will be continued ! Amazing nonsense ! Greek against Greek sure enough, or rather the argument itself turned *fêto de se*.

In illustration of this singular position, the author adduces "slaves of different plantations *legally* married," and sold, the husband to one owner and the wife to another. This is horrible enough, to be sure,—in the author's estimation far worse than slavery for life, or than one or all the evils of slavery besides,—for if he does not believe so, he has not counted upon the *liabilities* of slavery. The proposition is in the same category with the preceding ones, and one answer might answer them all ; but there are some points about this which I wish to notice. 1st. The author gravely talks about slaves *legally* married, as if such a thing happens among slaves. But grant that the marriage relation is allowed to slaves in a legal manner, how can an act of emancipation be attended with the forcible separation of husband and wife ? He tells us the husband may belong to one plantation and the wife to another ; if the husband is emancipated, he must forthwith leave the state, and leave his wife behind. Now in such a case he contends that slaveholding is not sin, and "emancipation would be heinous crime." And why does he think so ? Simply because he looks only at the surface of things. Had he penetration and sagacity in an ordinary degree, he would be slow and cautious in making up an opinion so dogmatical and irrepealable.

The American Anti-Slavery Society teaches that slavery, or slaveholding, is sin.

That whatever is inherently sinful is always wrong, and cannot be modified by circumstance, time or place.

That slaveholding being an evil, in its nature, is always wrong.

That slaveholding being established in theft, robbery, and piracy, and perpetuated by their continued action, transferred from generation to generation,—the appropriate name for slaveholder is man-thief—a scriptural phrase.

Now whatever is slaveholding or man-theft is sinful. If the holding of a slave for the slave's good be man-theft, then it is wrong, for no man has a right to assume responsibilities with which God has not invested him, and which he is unable to bear.

If holding a slave be for the slave's own pleasure, or happiness, it cannot alter the morality of the act : if the relation itself of master and slave is wrong, it cannot exist innocently for any reason whatsoever. The plea that emancipation will be succeeded by the separation of husbands and wives in some instances, is no argument against the duty of instant emancipation in **ALL CASES**. Is the relation of master to slave one which is morally, essentially wrong ? Then must it be dissolved. No fear of consequences should deter the speedy act. Will

it separate husband and wife? let them be separated then—let duty be done, though the heavens rush, the earth quake. To refuse to emancipate a slave under these circumstances, and for the benevolent purpose of giving him leave to remain with his wife and family, is a piece of morality upon a par, and in strict analogy with the kindness, which would rescue a robber or murderer out of the hands of *justice*, for the purpose of securing to him the blessings of his own fireside and the endearments of his wife and family. If we look at probabilities, expediency demands instant emancipation in the worst cases referred to. If a slaveholder sees the sin and wickedness of holding men as chattels, let him proclaim instant freedom, though the law of the State prohibits. What will be the consequence? The consequence? who can tell!! His slaves perchance must be excluded from their former homes and leave wives and husbands in slavery—themselves to seek their fortunes in a strange land. Well, grant it. Perhaps they are much afflicted, and pained and distressed, and may be their condition is far worse than before. But that it will be so, or that they *will* be forced to be separated from their wives, &c., no one can tell. Perhaps the single example of one planter in manumitting his slaves, may have such an effect upon his neighbors, as to induce them to go and do likewise; and the heaven may continue to work and slavery be destroyed. Who dare say that it will not?

It is the policy of slaveholders, no doubt, so to knit together the affections of slaves in neighboring plantations as to remove from many of them the desire of running away. A slave who has a beloved wife, will rather suffer in bondage than be separated from her, (this has nothing to do with the duty of the master in restraining his freedom, however, except it may indicate the duty of buying his wife and setting both free together,) and hence slaveholders themselves create the very difficulty which they consider a sufficient apology for retaining their slaves in bondage. There is not a difficulty nor obstacle in the way of immediate abolition which has not been begotten by the system of slavery.

I have all along been attaching the greatest confidence to the supposition, that there are cases where emancipation would cause separation of husbands and wives, parents and children, &c. &c. I have done so for sake of argument, and that the objection might have its full force. But really the proposition is so preposterous on the face of it, as almost to exclude serious thought. Every man's common sense will dictate to him, that where there is a desire on the part of a master to liberate his slaves, the ways and means will soon be at hand. All these objections are only apologies to soothe conscience and retain the slave; that is the system of slavery; for there are particular kinds of slaves who can only be an expense to the master. Yet if the whole affair of slavery was a burden, and slaveholders felt it to be such, instead of a convenience, there is no doubt but slavery would soon be got rid of, humanity and the laws to the contrary notwithstanding.

We have often been told in former years how much planters desired to liberate their slaves, and how many obstacles and impediments

there were in the way. We really believed that they were in earnest. But when the slaveholders discovered that abolition was gaining ground and becoming rife at the North, they quickly altered the tune of self condolence for the livelier note of defiance to all intermeddling with the institution of the Patriarchs.

Let it be here observed, that these particular cases which our author has conjured up at great pains, if they do have a real existence, exist only as *exceptions* to a grand rule, and he condemns the principles of a society by and for its exceptions, and not by its general rules, nor according to its general operations. True, the purpose of the objector is to find out a flaw in the principles of the society; but reasoning as he does, not from principle, but from sheer expediency, it hardly concerns him to know whether a thing be right or wrong in itself, if it will only answer a purpose. But waiving this point; I have only to remark further on the 3d Proposition, lest I be misunderstood, that there is no exception whatever to the general, universal law, that ALL slaveholding is sinful, and I stand ready to vindicate the American Anti-Slavery Society, from every charge brought against it, and to cleanse it from the aspersions of busy-bodies, slanderers and mud-throwers.

Our author having come to the conclusion, that in all similar examples (examples where husband and wife were parted by emancipation!) *slaveholding is duty and emancipation would be "heinous crime;"* having finished the *argumentum*—completed the three *illustrated* propositions, and made out as many as half a score "non sequiturs," drives off upon an element more congenial—the slam bang pathos. Here the Dr. is at home. Having upset all the principles of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and put all emancipation to the rout—he turns, with all the fury of a wild bull of Bashan, to discomfit every abolitionist in the land. He now declares that "these proofs and illustrations are submitted out of a great multitude, in proof that the indiscriminate denunciation of the act of slaveholding in all cases *is itself* a heinous crime." To be sure, why a'int it? He continues, "we have purposely omitted to name the instances so often referred to, in which slaves are bought from purely benevolent motives," &c. &c. And further, "all these, however, and many others which might be named, are examples of slaveholding in which the act of claiming and holding property in man is not sin, and in which the master is justifiable in retaining his fellow men in bondage by the golden rule of the Divine Redeemer, nor can he perform the act of emancipation without a violation of that rule. And moreover such has been the influence of Christianity upon the hearts of southern masters and mistresses, that there are thousands of them who continue to be slaveholders *for no other reason* than that they religiously believe that emancipation is impossible without sin."

Now against this array of unconscionable Christianity, as our unconscionable author would have it, the American Anti-Slavery Society is exerting all its force in the shape of "flagrant injustice and cruel falsehood." "They are guilty," says he, "of bearing false witness against their neighbors." Yea, verily! "The golden rule," he says, "is acknowledged and revered by *thousands of Christians who hold*

slaves in the southern states, as sacredly as by any of the Christians of the north." I would like to know how the golden rule can be acknowledged by any one who *makes chattels of men*. Would he himself like to become a chattel? would our sage author be willing to reciprocate the golden rule with a slave? would he while suffering under the lash, a process which might be salutary in his case, still believe that slavery could ever derive its origin from that book which declares, whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them? I trow not. Our author is at great pains to discriminate between "tweedle dum and tweedle dee"—between slaveholding on savage, and slaveholding on Christian principles—between holding slaves for sake of filthy lucre, or for the slaves' own benefit; in short betwixt sinning for money and sinning through benevolence. And he is particularly solicitous to impress his readers with the belief that he is a great enemy to the "system of slavery." While contending that "slavery as a system is a great political, social, and moral evil to any country," he contends that "slaveholding" in many "circumstances is not sin by any law either human or divine." Thus making a system evil, and the author and upholder of the same system innocent. And this is done by the force of circumstances!

"Having shown that slaveholding is not in all cases sinful, by the presentation of a few only of the instances in which it is not so, [the reader of the Appeal will appreciate the "presentation,"] it follows that the other principles being built upon this are equally fallacious. 'Immediate, instant abolition' becomes duty by the showing of abolitionists themselves, only because the act of slaveholding is sin, [how he reasons!] and all men are bound to cease sinning immediately. As however it must now be apparent to all men of reason and religion that their premises are assumed and contrary to the fact in a multitude of examples of slaveholding, like those here named, their conclusion is what logicians call a non sequitur. To reason correctly on false premises is one of the attributes of insanity."

Thus our author felicitates himself, in having as he imagines stormed the anti-slavery castle. He boasts of having "*shown* that slaveholding is not in all cases sinful." In what way has he shown this? By comparing the act of holding man as property, alias manstealing, with the word of God? Has he shown it by the stipulation and penalties of the eighth commandment—by the thunders of Sinai announcing that "whoso stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death?" Has he defined slavery or slaveholding? Has he explained its nature, character, tendencies and results? Oh no, he was taken short by a fit of unconquerable philanthropy, and had neither time nor inclination to inquire whether slaveholding is right or not, for he *sees* its blessed effects in preventing husbands from being separated from their wives, parents from their children, &c. &c. A far sighted man! One of the greatest evils, and most undeniable effects of slavery or slaveholding, is the frequent separation of families and dear friends and relations. No one will have the hardihood to deny that slavery is the parent of these evils; but our author declares that slaveholding *prevents these evils*. Here is a predicament. Slaveholding cannot produce opposite effects.

So far are the "premises" of the Anti-Slavery Society, stamping

slaveholding to be sin, from being merely "assumed," that their most notorious opponents admit them, in the "abstract." Assumed indeed! when definition upon definition has been given, and American Slaveholding shown, by irrefragable, undeniable testimony, from the Bible and the laws of our own land, to be a system of robbery, piracy, and murder. Assumed! And it may be assumed as a first principle—the light of nature teaches the disgraceful fact, that American slaveholding is in its own nature wrong, contravening the natural order of things.

But it appears after all, according to the Appeal, that the conclusion of the abolitionists is a "non sequitur." That is, it does not follow that *ALL slaveholding is sinful*, (although slaveholding is *inherently* sinful, which is the abolitionist's premise,) because *sinless* examples of slaveholding have been shown." And thus it goes round and round in a circle. The author has failed, because he attempts to reason without principles, data or premises, and so far may escape the charge which he has invoked upon the false reasoner. He undertakes to show that slaveholding is right; not from giving any account of its nature or effects, nor even from the *motive* of the slaveholder, which were a better argument, but because *slaveholding PREVENTS* the separation of husband and wife, parents and children. If this be not a "non sequitur," no demented fool ever made one.

The author now takes a "glance at the measures pursued by this American Anti-Slavery Society. And these, (says he) are to be sought not in their professions, but in their acts, for while the former look harmless, the latter have been mighty for evil." And after a full volley of misrepresentation, falsehood and abuse, he concludes: "and yet such is a true picture of the phrenzy of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and the measures pursued by its agents and presses, *without any known exception.*"

To prevent these charges from doing the evil intended, nothing further is necessary than to apprise the public of the source whence they sprang, and to show the relations of their author to community, and to the Anti-Slavery Society.

It seems from some remarks made by our author in a former publication, that he had been pretty roughly handled by a certain abolitionist of the despised caste. But the public is acquainted with this, and so I will proceed.

"The limits of this pamphlet," (continues he) "will not suffice for extracts, and happily they are unequalled for, since all men of reason and religion who have looked into *any* of the publications (Judge Jay's Inquiry, and Weld's Bible argument for instance, or vice versa, the "Extinguisher Extinguished") or listened to any of the harangues (Wm. G. Birney's for instance) of the sect, must have abundant evidence that such is the fact." (Now follows a splendid exhibition of logic and veracity.) "How many of their fellow citizens they may have convinced by such arguments, may be estimated by the *number of slaves who have been emancipated* through their instrumentality, should they ever be favored with *any measure of success*, in their anti-slavery work; but it is certain that neither the understanding nor conscience of any slaveholder in this nation has been reached, so far as their history written by themselves will testify."

First, we will take a view of the logic in the above extract. The

author very generously offers to estimate the number of *citizens* converted by anti-slavery arguments, according to the number of slaves who have been emancipated through their instrumentality. But a moment's reflection will convince any one that this is a wild manner of computing the efficiency of anti-slavery arguments,—I speak in relation to forming a *correct* estimate of *results* from previous efforts. For instance, an anti-slavery society *may* exist for years in the North before one slave is emancipated by virtue of the Society's arguments. But meanwhile the Society may have "*convinced*" many hundred thousands of "*citizens*."

Secondly. Let us notice the author's veracity in the above extract: "Should they *ever* be favored," says he, "with any *measure of success* in their anti-slavery work." How any one can publish an implied falsehood so downright, unless he is lost to all shame, I cannot conceive. "But," he continues, "it is certain that neither the understanding nor conscience of *any* slaveholder in this nation has been reached, so far as their history written by themselves will testify." This is palpably false, and the author must know it. James G. Birney has published in detail the account of manumission by himself of six slaves, and the account also of about, I think, twenty-five others. The whole number emancipated through the influence of the American Anti-Slavery Society probably exceeds a thousand. But the work has only just begun, and the manumissions have exceeded the expectations of the most sanguine. I ought to observe that the American Anti-Slavery Society has succeeded in convincing about half a million of our "*citizens*" that *slaveholding* is wrong and ought to be abolished immediately.

The author now pretends to furnish a few of the "*legitimate results*," as he says, "of the American Anti-Slavery Society, its principles and measures."

"1st. The slaves in most of our southern states have suffered an awful increase in the rigors and severities of their bondage, which resentment or timidity on the part of the masters, has inflicted," &c. &c.

This is mere slang, altogether too stale for use. It is no fault of the American Anti-Slavery Society that masters increase the rigors of slavery, were that a fact. There is not a principle of the American Anti-Slavery Society that sanctions or encourages rigorous treatment; hence it cannot be chargeable upon the society. To say that the discussion of slavery by the North has *proved the occasion* of Southern inhumanity to be exercised in a more rigorous manner against the slave may be true; but where does the blame rest? most surely where it belongs, viz., in the system of slavery. *Slaveholding*, when assailed by the weapons of truth, may find it necessary in self-defence to increase its rigors; shall the weapons of truth therefore not be directed against it? No enemy will leave a fortress without a resisting struggle. Strike a reptile, and it will bite.

I cannot leave this topic without suggesting the inquiry, whether the many "*thousands of Christians*" who hold slaves "*because of the necessity of the case*, and from motives of benevolence and humanity

only," whether they likewise are subjected to the "resentment or timidity" which urges them to "*increase*" the "rigors and severities" of their bondmen? One would think they would almost be tempted out of clear spite and ill will to the slaves to give them their liberty!

2d Result. "The free colored people" suffer "proscription and banishment," are "laboring under disabilities and embarrassments," and "prejudice" has been created and increased against them, and all in consequence of "the measures of their pseudo friends."

This is the sum and substance of our author's remarks under this head. The reply to the "1st result" will serve in this case as well as the first, as the principle of the objection, or cavil rather, is the same in both. Suffice it to add, that the "free people of color" know their "friends," and they are very far from being duped by the knavery of such incorrigible blunderers and reckless perverters of the truth, and wresters of righteousness and truth, as our author shows himself to be of.

3d Result. "The American Colonization Society, which *without directly interfering* with the slave question," [by the way, observe how potent and efficient the Colonization Society is to emancipate slaves, and yet it never interferes with the slave question!] "was silently and surely awakening universal sympathy in behalf of the whole African race; elevating the free and mitigating the rigors of bondage where it failed to effect emancipation, *has been hindered.*"

Has what!—*has been hindered* in its work of *unmixed* philanthropy (!) and *temporarily* obstructed in its progress, (Oh, what a concession! how humiliating!) What, "*unmixed* philanthropy," intent on its glorious object, "*hindered*," frustrated, "*obstructed*!" For shame; had it neither heart nor head, nor limbs, nor motion to resist aggression? Puissant philanthropy! offspring and sire of the Colonization Society, why didst thou droop and wither before the scorching rays of abolition truth? Thou art indeed vanquished, not "*temporarily obstructed*," but for ever defeated, discomfited, conquered, overthrown, demolished, overwhelmed, abolished, destroyed, annihilated!

"The measures of the A. A. S. Society," says our author, "have, by their imprudence and violence, provoked some of the southern states, or frightened them from their propriety," &c. Now, indeed! if they can be "*provoked or frightened from their propriety*," perhaps they may be provoked or frightened into it again. States that lose their propriety by the measures of abolitionists, "so that they will not allow any individual or society to agitate the subject of slavery or emancipation within their borders," must have a great horror of the truth; and it is the truth, and the truth alone contained in anti-slavery principles, and exemplified in anti-slavery measures, that causes such a scampering of slaveholders from their "*propriety*."

But the colonization humbug had a different way of doing up matters. It told the slaveholder that his slave property was as inviolable as any other species of property—that it did not touch the right nor interfere with the practice of holding men as property. It scorned to do any such thing—it was polite and gentlemanly in its deportment, extremely courteous and insinuating in address, astonishingly versatile

and accommodating, so that it never gave offence ; but could blow hot and cold at the same breath, and tell a story for every latitude. In the North it put on the air and habit of a missionary, and told, oh, what marvels, of Elysium glories that are to be in Africa, when the whole African race shall be transported across the Atlantic and set up for themselves "in their own, their native land ;" then shall they rise to manhood instant, as if by magic, and be acknowledged as brethren of the human family by those who treat them as brutes ! But I am afraid of being carried away by this enchanting theme, and must leave it to consider the

4th Result. Our author here charges the Anti-Slavery Society with delaying "the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia half a century at least."

And he repeats the old falsehood and slander, a thousand times refuted, that events were approaching the abolition of slavery in the District when abolitionism came in like a sweeping tornado and prostrated every thing before it. One thing appears to be granted, and that is this, abolitionism has a tremendous influence at any rate, 'be it for weal or wo, and it must and *will* go. Now I would advise certain ones who are fond of popularity, to beware how they resist this current of anti-slavery, lest they be swept away.

5th Result. "The cause of emancipation has received a shock ;" "the progress of *gradual* abolition itself been almost entirely arrested." Men of "wisdom, prudence, weight of character, and philanthropy"—[the real *Simon Pures*,] "have been silenced and obliged to retire from the conflict until modern abolitionism shall burn out with the intensity of its own fires." [Who have been silenced ? Who ? Why, these same men, when] "pleading with trumpet-tongued and spirit-stirring eloquence in behalf of gradual, peaceable, and entire emancipation, and who had already succeeded in shaking the mighty pillars on which the edifice of slavery stood."

What a pity they had not tipped it over when it was shaking ! Can any thing excuse them for this sad oversight ? Why, they had the work almost done—the ruin of slavery upon the point of a moment, and yet they failed to consummate the much desired event ! and why ? Because some abolitionists stepped in at that moment to give them a lift, and "while clamorously opening their mouths for the dumb," they not only shut the mouths of these "trumpet-tongued" advocates of gradual emancipation, but "obliged them to retire from the conflict." The facts in the case appear to be these : The "spirit-stirring" advocates of gradual emancipation never dreamed about "shaking the pillars of slavery." They were, I suppose, the agents and advocates of the Colonization Society to whom our author refers. For instance, take R. R. Gurley, William L. Stone, and David, M. Reese, as specimens. They took hold of the pillars of slavery to be sure, and heaved, oh, how Samson-like ! but not like Samson did they prevail. The old towers would not come,—indeed they made no opposition to the citadel of slavery, but instead thereof, built bulwarks about it, and it was to scare them from this uncharitable toil that the abolitionists beset them. Instead of making the pillars of slavery shake, they were striving to build ramparts and buttlements to protect them. The

abolitionists bid them stop that work, and "obliged them to retire from the conflict," because they wanted to occupy the ground themselves for a different and better purpose. They did not literally *drive* them from the field, but the Colonizationists found their work undone so much faster than they could do it, that they concluded it better to retire than suffer continued defeat. How potent is abolitionism, even by the showing of its enemies! It has uprooted and overthrown colonizationism. It has made "those of the slave states which were engaged in devising and executing plans for the gradual and entire removal of slavery from their limits, pause," &c. The moral power of the civilized world, says our veracious author, "was arrayed in one unbroken phalanx against slavery wherever it exists." "But, alas for the enslaved! the mad measures of misguided friends," &c. Here follows a string of execrations, winding up with the account of frightening the genuine friends of the slave "from the conflict," as we have seen: "Meanwhile such true friends of the enslaved" must "weep" and "wait a better time," and "resume their labors under more promising auspices. Thus has the great and glorious cause of emancipation been postponed for a century by the vehemence and folly of the American Anti-Slavery Society."

The "cause of emancipation," the reader will observe, "has been postponed half a century longer than the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia."—(See "4th Result.") But I am mistaken, one has been "postponed for a century;" the other thrown back *half* a century, which will bring them out even.

6th Result. Here our author states that "all the horrors of the African slave-trade are justly chargeable upon the American Anti-Slavery Society,"—assuming that colonies on the coast of Africa *prevent* the slave-trade; and affirming that the Anti-Slavery Society prevents the formation of colonies, thus deriving the *ergo*, that all the kidnapping on the African coast must be set down to the account of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

This is one of the old slanders brought up against the Society ever since it began to make such fearful inroads into the ranks of colonization; and I am surprised that any one should bring it up again at this late hour of the day.

It has been satisfactorily shown from the histories of colonies on the coast of Africa, that so far are they from preventing, arresting, or diminishing the slave-trade, that they actually furnish facilities and means to carry it on. I would here refer to letters of the colonial agents and governors of Sierra Leone in confirmation of the facts, but the facts themselves are so well known as to render such pains unnecessary. The colony of Liberia has furnished supplies of provision, water, &c., to slave ships, and if I am not mistaken, some members of the colony itself have had something to do directly or indirectly in helping on the slave trade. At least I have seen hints of that kind pretty well authenticated. The history of Hilary Teague may throw some light on this subject, as also the recent account of Jones.

7th Result. "Another result," says our author, "of the American Anti-Slavery Society, a legitimate consequence of its measures, has been apparent in various parts of our country in the growing spirit of lawlessness and misrule,

of contempt for the public authorities, and a disposition to effect by violence, what cannot be obtained by law," &c.

And all this is the result of the American Anti-Slavery Society !! This seventh charge is entitled to some respect and consideration. It is new and original. No one before has ever started on this track, at least not to come out with one universal gathering of "lawlessness and misrule," to lay them at the door of the American Anti-Slavery Society. The charge is grotesque and ludicrous, and assuredly *proves* that the author's brain has given way in one spot at least. It is in strict analogy with the charge brought against our Saviour, "he casteth out devils through Beelzebub;" or the cry against the apostle—he turneth the world upside down, and causes tumults and dissensions among the people;—in short, the charge is *false*, and I challenge its "mendacious" author to sustain it by one single example. The principles of the Society expressly discountenance any thing like insubordination to law, or resistance by physical force to even personal insult. I think no candid man will deny that Abolitionists have suffered greater provocations, insults, and maltreatment unresistingly, than any other class or denomination of men, in this or any other country. How many of them have been mobbed, lynched, and persecuted,—suffered the spoiling of their goods, and were in danger of their lives? and yet we do not know of one, scarcely, that ever sued for redress. But we are gravely charged by the writer of exciting articles in a daily newspaper of this city, that the "growing spirit of lawlessness and misrule, &c., in our country proceeds from the inculcation and spread of anti-slavery doctrines." The charge is base, malicious, slanderous and false; nor would I waste a moment in refuting it, were it not to show that our author comes in for a share in setting lawlessness and misrule in operation, in proportion to the influence he may have in society. We will hear him a little further:

"The first impulse was given to this spirit by the attempt made by the American Anti-Slavery Society to seat the whites and blacks promiscuously in Chatham-street Chapel, New-York, at their anniversary meeting."

The assertion that the American Anti-Slavery Society attempted to seat the whites and blacks promiscuously, &c., is I apprehend, totally false. Individual abolitionists *may* have attempted it. I do not know that they did; but had this even been the case, although I disapprove of any kind of intermingling contrary to mutual consent, it were no matter to raise a song about. It violated no principle of duty: that it should *create* a spirit of mobocracy is monstrous logic.

It is a little singular that our author has not spoken further of this meeting in the chapel, inasmuch as one Doctor Reese acted a very conspicuous part in it. It was the meeting where the celebrated examination of Thomas C. Brown, a resident of the land of promise, Liberia, took place. Now the part that colonizationists acted in this meeting, may serve to explain the "first impulse given to this spirit, &c." It is well known that the meeting was broken up either immediately preceding or consequent upon a speech from Dr. Reese—

that Mr. Gurley, Secretary or Agent of the Colonization Society, was called to the chair, and made a speech, in which he uttered the oft quoted phrase, "I go with the South." It proceeds :

"The subsequent deeds of violence known as the abolition mobs, &c., were the fruits of the denunciatory language, and violent measures of the Society and its friends."

Here is another new discovery. It is now clearly ascertained according to the appeal that the *Courier and Inquirer*, and especially the *Commercial Daily Advertiser*, (edited by Col. Stone, and assisted about that time by Dr. Reese,) had no hand in raising the mobs ! The abolitionists did it all themselves to mob the abolitionists !

The author next charges the American Anti-Slavery Society with lending its "sanction to the forcible rescue of fugitive slaves detained by authority of law," &c. This is rather a weak charge ; the author having failed to make out the counts to the indictment. "Their sanction," he says, "is given ;" but this is very indefinite language. If it be true that they "sanction," &c., let the manner be shown, the example exhibited. But the American Anti-Slavery Society I believe has had nothing to do or say in the matter of fugitive slaves.

What is chiefly remarkable in regard to outbreaks and outrages of the people, in the mind of the sagacious author, is the all-convincing fact, that previous to the formation of the Anti-Slavery Society no such occurrences took place. Hear him :

"They (mobs) have been accompanied by circumstances of enormity which never before attended upon mobs in the history of this country."

And thus he proceeds at length, and all this as already quoted, "the fruits of the violent measures of the Society and its friends."

Now it would be quite as reasonable and logical to affirm, that the cholera never appeared in the city of New-York until 1832, the year after the formation of the first Anti-Slavery Society, and therefore the American Anti-Slavery Society was the cause of the cholera.

"Even the churches and the ministers of religion have been visited with mob vengeance, for the first time in this Republic."

The first time, and therefore, because they were not visited by mobs before, the American Anti-Slavery Society caused them ! most surely, for

"Why is it that the desolating prevalence of these mischiefs has spread over the land with the swiftness of an epidemic within four or five years past ? To what other cause can they be rationally attributed than the new and unheard of violence of the measures of abolitionists ?"

What Tartars and cut-throats these abolitionists must be ! and the American Anti-Slavery Society must be a thousand times worse than the council of Pandemonium ! Our author is hereabouts most maliciously beset by the cramps, methinks, or the devil,—he is stark mad, and I would fear he was near to destruction, according to his

quotation "quem Deus, &c.," were I not fully satisfied that not God but the devil has made him mad. Mark how he raves :

"When Anti-Slavery Societies, conventions, or orators, publicly proclaim war against the constitution of the United States [this charge is *glaringly false*, the author using none of the qualifications or explanations of the Society] by calling it fit only for devils to make, &c. &c.—When churches are desecrated by the repetition of public anathemas against Southern men, &c. &c.—That such measures have been followed by such results within the last few years, are facts which can neither be denied nor gainsayed; and as they never before occurred in similar number or enormity, [logic!] the *inference* among men of reason and religion is unavoidable [it might be unavoidable to block-heads and ninnies,] that they are legitimate results of the American Anti-Slavery Society."

Thus he repeats, that because these riots and mobs never happened until within a few years, *therefore* they are caused by the American Anti-Slavery Society! Upon this tack of reasoning I would like to know what occurrences of the last four or five years the aforesaid Society has *not* caused. It has caused the Indian war in Florida, and the war in Canada, and the war in Texas; for these "never before occurred;" "the inference among men of reason and religion" therefore is "unavoidable that they are legitimate results of the American Anti-Slavery Society." And never before did this country experience such a *pressure* as it did last year; never before the 16th December, 1835, was so devastating a fire in this city: the inference is plain that they were the "legitimate results of the American Anti-Slavery Society!!" Our author probably does not know that antecedents and consequents have not the same relation to each other that causes and effects have. But perhaps these are his "*sequiturs*," of which he makes so great account!

The author now goes into a close argument against the measures of the American Anti-Slavery Society in "officially sanctioning the forcible rescue of fugitive slaves," and lashes himself into fury when inveighing against the injustice done to slaveholders by "concealing and abducting their slaves," &c. I have already said that the American Anti-Slavery Society has nothing to do "officially" in concealing, abducting, or rescuing fugitive slaves; the charge is wholly *false*. As a member and secretary of the *Vigilance Committee* I have a right to know whence the committee derives its powers. The American A. S. Society has a right to express an opinion relative to this Committee, and this that Society can do without rendering itself liable for the acts of the Committee. The Colonization Society might express their opinion favorable to the Vigilance Committee without becoming responsible for its acts; and as this Committee has rescued more victims from bondage and wretchedness than the Colonization Society during the whole of its existence; and as the Colonists of the Vigilance Committee are far more prosperous, happy and contented than the inheritors of the land of milk and honey in Africa, I think it must be conceded according to our author's own mode of reasoning, that it would be "cruel," and a "heinous crime" to send back slaves to masters who want to get rid of them, and who hold them as slaves, "only because of the necessity of the case, and from motives of

benevolence and humanity ;" in fact, " who continue to be slaveholders for no other reason than that they religiously believe that emancipation is impossible without sin." Now a little aid of the Vigilance Committee will save a great deal of the wear and tear of conscience incident to these scrupulous and pious slaveholders ;—I say *pious*, because many of the runaway slaves report that their " masters and mistresses" were very religious, church-going people. It will greatly facilitate emancipation, *for which Christian slaveholders are longing and praying !*

But seriously, let us look a little into the subject, for our author makes serious charges against the Society in relation to this matter. He is all at once jealousy-struck for order and the maintenance of law, and has a mighty horror of " mobs," and the " Lynch code." Perhaps the tide of public sentiment is turning so fast that he begins to fear the infliction of Lynch law upon himself, by virtue of the "*lex talionis*." But he need not fear, abolitionists will never touch a hair of his head, nor ever call a mob to disperse public meetings, or hunt citizens from place to place. There is such a thing, however, as a moral Lynching—a process very apropos to certain writers of *Appeals*, &c. Let this hint suffice for the present. We proceed with the Appeal.

" They [the American Anti-Slavery Society] organize combinations for this purpose [for rescuing fugitive slaves] as well as for *clandestinely concealing* ['the shady shadow of the umbrageous tree !'] and abducting into Canada or elsewhere, fugitive slaves, knowing them to be such, and publicly glory in their success in these lawless acts of *kidnapping and man-stealing*, in defiance of the Constitution of the United States, and our own laws."

How the sapient author makes out a case of *kidnapping and man-stealing* in the transaction quoted, admitting it to be true, I cannot perceive. If it be a " heinous crime" to give slaveholders, slavedrivers, slavecatchers, and slavekillers, the title of *menstealers and kidnappers*, why shall those who are engaged in making restoration to the *proper owners* be called by those names ?

" Why," says he, " they do it in defiance of the Constitution of the United States." I beg his pardon, the Constitution of the United States does not recognise slavery. It has not the word slave, or slavery in it ; its framers were ashamed to disgrace it by such a term.

" The Constitution of the United States," as well as " our own laws," acknowledge the first great fundamental doctrine of human rights, that all men are entitled to liberty and the pursuit of happiness in what way and *where* they may think fit. Now when a portion of our citizens at the South wish to change their residence for a more northerly clime, for sake of their health or happiness, shall we contravene their honest intentions ? Ought we not rather to assist them, especially if they are poor, and helpless, and friendless, as some of them are ? Who is there in this land so brutish as would lay his clutches upon a poor slave just escaping from bondage ? Not one, I trust, save a Nash, a Boudinot, or perhaps our order-loving author.

"Thus," he continues, "they give the weight and provocation of their own example to the prevalence of mob law, unless it be pretended that to mob a slaveholder is innocent, and to mob an abolitionist is 'heinous crime.'"

Now who ever heard of mobbing a slaveholder? But our ingenious author comes at it by inference. He says:

"For if it be right to deprive a slaveholder of his legal rights by Lynch law, either by force or stratagem, on the plea that the laws are unjust or inefficient, will not the same argument be urged by" mobites, &c.?

The slaveholder has no legal right to any human being residing or sojourning temporarily or otherwise in the State of New-York. The laws of our state do not recognise property in men, but consider every human being as the proprietor of his own person. The laws of the United States we have seen do not assert this right; therefore, every slave who strays from bondage is the proper subject of our kindness, humanity, and protection from kidnappers; for the recovery of a runaway slave is a fresh act of kidnapping.

There are also certain laws, which by their own nature are not binding: and the non-observance of them is duty, and will never lead to mobs or insubordination while the world standeth. Such a law, for instance, as it would be, if the United States should compel a sovereign state to deliver up runaway slaves from another state. I know some such law is found in the "compact" relative to "persons held to service," &c.; but as these *persons* may be held to service, they of course *owe*, and are able to *owe* service. But a slave is not a *person*, but a *chattel*, and cannot owe any thing; therefore the "compact" does not refer to slaves at all! But again. The Constitution does not recognise slavery, or any right whatever to deprive an innocent person of his liberties, and it is clear therefore that Congress cannot constitutionally restrain a man of his liberty in any of the states.

But our author admits that the laws which the American Anti-Slavery Society thus violate, *may* be "bad laws," yet he says:

"It is vain to allege the existence of inefficient or bad laws as a justifiable pretext for taking the law into our own hands, for all such acts, by whomsoever performed, are examples of Lynching," &c. &c.

Our author here makes the assumption, to help the argument along, which I am not disposed to admit. Abolitionists do not "*take the law into their own hands*" in any act of *procuring the escape of a slave*. Much less does the American Anti-Slavery Society violate the law, as he strives to make appear, by refusing or neglecting to censure any of its members for having a share in assisting slaves to escape. This is the sum of the Society's offence, and for this our *excruciating* author would degrade that noble institution to a level with mobs of his own raising. Shameless, and fruitless attempt!

Now I contend, that favoring, encouraging, assisting, nay, procuring the escape of a slave from bondage to liberty is a violation of no law of the land, and I am sure if my opponent has ever read his Bible he will not contend that it is contrary to the precepts and the

spirit of that blessed book. If, however, he should have any qualms of conscience about it I would refer him to Deut. xxiii. 15 : "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee." *

I know of no law that makes it the duty of a citizen to return fugitive slaves to their masters. There is a law by which slaveholders may claim and recover fugitives from "service," but there is a wide difference between suffering the law to have its full effect unresistingly, and taking an active part in returning runaway slaves. Will my opponent say, that if we do not assist in returning refugees we do impliedly resist the laws? I agree with him; but it is in the first place an *implied resistance*, and in the second place, it is just such a resistance as will violate no laws, but on the contrary tend rapidly to *alter* them "in a constitutional way." I may, I *must* suffer the laws of the government under which I live, but I must not *obey* them if they are contrary to the laws of God. The first principles of government teach the doctrine that the inferior must yield to the superior, and man's law to God's law. Now if a class of men will not volunteer to return refugees to bondage should a law to that effect be in existence, because God has declared "thou shalt not return the servant that has escaped from his master," are they to be ranked with the riotous and disorderly, the offscouring and dregs of the community? How absurd! They are only *suffering* in resistance to unjust laws, and that for conscience sake, while these are violating the first principles of order, and sapping the foundations of government. To make one represent or illustrate the other were as absurd as to explain light by darkness,—the cases are wholly different. My limits will not permit me to enter into a discussion of this point, or I would show, clearly, by the example of Paul and other apostles, that wicked and unjust laws *must* be *resisted* even unto *death*; and this too while in a state of being *subject* to the laws. Paul was *subject* to the laws which consigned him to death, which proves conclusively that *he* never meant that obedience to "magistrates" should transcend obedience to God.

I might have spared all these remarks, but for a desire to indulge, for old acquaintance sake, my veritable opponent, my *quondam* antagonist in times of yore, for his whole argument is built upon the false assumption that the American Anti-Slavery Society "organize combinations," for the purpose of "the forcible rescue of fugitive slaves from the officers of justice, while they are detained under due process of law." Now my opponent's assertion is grossly false. The only "combination organized" for any purpose relative to refugees is the New-York Committee of Vigilance, which is an organization deriving no power, authority, or instruction from the American Anti-Slavery Society, and having no connection with it at

* Here is a recognition of the relation of *master* and *servant*, but the command proves incontestably, that the servant's rights were as strictly guarded as the master's; that the condition of servant was voluntary, and that it was the duty of others so far to *interfere* as to protect the servant from being reinstated in servitude contrary to his wishes.

all. The object of this Committee, so far from rescuing fugitive slaves from officers of justice, is expressly formed for the very purpose of bringing refugees and others within the administration and protecting power of officers of justice,—when I say officers of justice, I do not wish to be understood as meaning such harpies as Nash or Boudinot, whose very names are a terror to justice itself. This Committee of Vigilance,* I have said, is the only organization to which my opponent *can* refer, and I challenge him to the proof of one attempt on the part of said committee to rescue a slave *contrary* to law. The whole is a fiction; nay worse, it is a wicked, slanderous, lying charge. It was necessary for him to fix upon something as a nucleus round which to agglutinate falsehood and billingsgate, sufficient to make a heap. He calls it Lynch law to rescue a slave from officers of justice! Well, no such thing was ever done by any organization in this country or city! He calls it Lynching, to assist the slave in escaping? Why who is Lynched! He calls it “taking the laws into their own hands” when men strive to effect “any object which they cannot effect by law.” This is a singular sentiment, a strange position to take! Why who is not striving to effect objects which he cannot effect by law! If he could effect them by law, he would not strive, goosy! Perhaps my opponent means to effect objects *contrary* to law—in violation of law. If so, he must substantiate his charge. He concludes this 7th result, by saying that the American Anti-Slavery Society, are “justly accountable for all the mobs throughout our land!”

* I have in the text been careful to admit every charge of my opponent which I could consistently for the purpose of meeting him upon his own ground. My first object was to show that the American Anti-Slavery Society, is perfectly disconnected with any “combination” to assist fugitive slaves in escaping. I have admitted that the New-York Committee of Vigilance did assist in protecting these fugitives, but the admission was only for the purpose of justifying the act, supposing it to have taken place. But in order to show that this committee does nothing contrary to law, I will quote the 2d and 3d articles of the Constitution.

“Art. 2. The objects of the New-York Committee of Vigilance, are to effect the protection and relief of such inhabitants of this city and state, who are *liable to be illegally aggrieved, kidnapped, and reduced to slavery.*”

“Art. 3. To render them all the aid and advantages in maintaining their title to liberty *which the laws will afford.*”

From these two articles of the Constitution which express all that is said of the objects and measures of the committee, it will be seen, that the New-York Committee of Vigilance, do not justly fall under the censures and charges of my opponent. I need not mention in this place that our own citizens are liable to be arrested and forcibly carried away into interminable bondage without the benefit of a trial. The object of the Committee of Vigilance is to afford such unhappy victims legal redress.

I have stated that the New-York Committee of Vigilance, is the only organization for this purpose; but I ought perhaps to include the *Manumission Society* of this city, which has nobly assisted in protecting endangered citizens when unwarrantably arrested by kidnappers as fugitive slaves. Since the abolition of slavery in the state of New-York, the attention of this society has been directed almost exclusively to the education of colored children; but still they are engaged in the laudable effort of protecting the defenceless poor against the aggressions of kidnappers.

"8th Result." Here my opponent makes a dash into the Congress of the United States, and charges all the "temper and passion" there exhibited upon the American Anti-Slavery Society.* Hear him :

"Failing in producing agitation, petitions are sent, signed by women, by children, by *white* and colored people ; and at length a petition from slaves came before Congress, and now the excitement sought after begins. Year after year another and another exciting topic connected with the slave question in the District, in the Territories and in Texas, are urged upon Congress, signed by whites and blacks, male and female, and even the children of Sabbath Schools, until the tables are deluged with such petitions."

Thus he proceeds : Now the obvious intent of my opponent, is to fix odium upon the American Anti-Slavery Society ; to do this he will sacrifice almost any thing, if indeed he has any thing in the shape of character left to sacrifice. He here tells of petitions sent to Congress signed by various persons. Well, what of all that ? What of all that ? Why, they have led to the passage of the gag law, "and every other violent measure, both in and out of Congress, owe their origin to the phrenzy of modern abolitionism, for which the American Anti-Slavery Society is justly responsible." Hence the excitement about the treasury bill, and the excitement about the land bill, and the war appropriations, and the troubles in Florida, and Canada, and Mexico, all have proceeded from the American Anti-Slavery Society !

"9th Result." My opponent now considers the evils that have befallen the church, in consequence of abolitionism. He says :

"The unnumbered and intolerable mischiefs which many of the Christian Churches have endured, and are now suffering as the result of the principles and measures of the American Anti-Slavery Society, may now be glanced at, although no pen can adequately portray them."

Then follows a page or two of fulsome trash, rigmarole and rant, the whole of which I cannot quote, and will content myself with a few lines. His remarks upon ministers refusing to read anti-slavery notices—trustees declining to open their churches, and members of churches praying for slaves, are too *low* and ungentlemanly to deserve even a passing notice. In regard to excluding slaveholders "from the pulpits and ordinances of christianity," he raises quite a *dolorem*, and insists that slaveholders make quite as good if not better Christians than others—speaks of their relation to slaves, again, as one of necessity, of benevolence, etc. Again, he remarks upon the "folly and impiety of some abolition churches, for excluding northern brethren from the privileges of the church." For what ? Because, as our *veracious* author asserts, they decline to be "bona fide members of the Anti-Slavery Society ?" I call for the proof—I do not believe there is a church in the whole North, that makes *membership of the American Anti-Slavery Society*, a *requisite* for admission to its privileges and ordinances. Slavery or anti-slavery sentiments may be a *test* question, as it ought to be ; but my opponent is strained to get a charge against the society and so I excuse him.

* Dr. Reese, I think, signed a petition to Congress, about two years ago, for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

Let it be again remarked, that my opponent nowhere lays down a *principle* from which to deduce truth and draw correct conclusions, but when he pretends to reason, takes false premises, makes false assertions and false deductions; and it is not therefore surprising that his conclusions are not only false, but wild and ridiculous.

"10th Result." This "*result*" completes my opponent's decalogue, and is quite as scurvy as its predecessors. My amiable and accomplished antagonist speaks of "Anti-Slavery literature" with affected contempt. Their numerous publications, pamphlets, newspapers, &c. &c." (says he,) "are of a character most deplorably violent and mischievous—they seem to aim to have one or more papers bearing the name of Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist papers, for the purpose of carrying the war into the several religious denominations, &c."

How very shallow this last insinuation! "They seem to aim," &c., as if these papers of various religious denominations did not prove that anti-slavery principles had obtained in those denominations, instead of the base motive imputed by my opponent.

Some of these papers (says he) "employ themselves in hunting up and emblazoning to the world every thing in their own denomination which can be made to appear disreputable," &c. I call for proof, and pronounce the charge false. But hear the Appeal:

"If a runaway slave, comes along and tells any tales of horror," &c. (I refer the reader to page 15 of the Appeal for the sentiment at length,) "they scruple not on *such authority* to publish the most scandalous assaults upon the *sensitive feelings*, and personal character of respectable and pious men. These publications are often made against innocent persons and their characters, and the churches to which they belong are made to bleed beneath the wounds inflicted by worthless and infamous fugitives from *justice*, as well as from slavery."

"Fugitives from justice!" Here my opponent betrays himself, and shows very clearly on what side his sympathies are enlisted. A slave flying from bondage flees from justice! Slavery then is just and right! So says my opponent. His charges against anti-slavery publications, all lack proof—they are mere blank assertions. But here comes something extra:

"*Very often*, it is true, they (anti-slavery publications) are compelled by the injured parties to publish a full retraction of these base falsehoods, (I call for proof of *one* instance out of those that *very often* occur,) but they repeat these offences against truth and Christianity, until their character for mendacity becomes so notorious, that the abused and injured find protection from suffering in their reputation in the universal character which, in any community individuals and newspapers acquire, when it is known that lying is their vocation."

Here is a picture drawn by the graphic pen of my opponent! Of its merits, I leave the public to judge. It is mere slanderous assertion, unsustained, and incapable of proof. What follows under this head is absolutely too dirty to be quoted. I cannot descend to blackguardism and low scurrility, and must therefore dismiss this topic, and suffer my opponent to flounder alone in Jugurtha's bath.

"Such then are the facts before the world in relation to the principles and results of the American Anti-Slavery Society," says my pertinacious opponent; and he winds up the Appeal by recapitulating his lies, and like an arrant pettifogger calling upon *Gentlemen of the Jury!* to bring in a verdict in his favor.

I shall close this review with a very few remarks.

1st. I appeal to my opponent, the author of "An Appeal to the reason and religion of American Christians, against the American Anti-Slavery Society," whether he can, if he has any conscience or shamefacedness, reflect upon his silly, ungentlemanly, fiendish and yet impotent assault upon the American Anti-Slavery Society, and not blush to imagine that he belongs to the human species! Why will he still, viper-like, bite upon a file? Three years ago the public considered him "used up," but such an insatiable, indomitable *penchant* has he for notoriety, that he intrudes himself again upon the public, and though concealing his name, thinking thereby, no doubt, to escape deserved castigation, yet he displays his colors, and thus, indirectly challenges his antagonist; and being distinctly recognised by indubitable signs and marks, undeceivable as the bewildered and crazy "knight of the rueful countenance," he must expect to be cared for and treated as the symptoms of his malady seem to indicate. I now take my leave of him I hope for the last time. I do sincerely hope it may never again be necessary for me to appear as the antagonist of one, who has neither learning, ability or character, sufficient to arrest the attention, or provoke a reply or criticism from those who manage the affairs of the American Anti-Slavery Society, or who contribute to the funds of "*Anti-Slavery Literature*."

2. I appeal to "the reason and religion of American Christians" for "the American Anti-Slavery Society." I ask them to examine the principles of the society with candor and attention. Such an examination, and after this manner, is the duty of every American Citizen and especially every American Christian. Now the subject assumes an aspect of interest and moment, and imperiously demands attention. Even the enemies of abolition acknowledge it to be a mighty engine, and they regard its progress with portentous horror. Slavery is doomed to totter and fall, or Liberty to perish, and the crisis is at hand. The tide of abolitionism is rolling southward, with an overwhelming flood; and Southerners are tempest-tossed and fury-lashed, struggling in the flood and buffeting the waves—refusing the tender of emancipation, the only life boat—and crying draw and no quarter, madly rush upon their fate. Oh, what insanity! Slaveholders at the South and their apologists at the North have sought to silence abolitionism by every measure, both just and unjust, and every plan both good and evil which ingenuity could devise, or art suggest. At first they seemed sanguine of success, and informed each other of the insignificance and detested character of abolitionism—that it was fast disappearing, and thus they mutually deceived and reciprocated each other until the alarm bell was heard beyond the Potomac, and the startling summons reverberated from the Mississippi: "Slaveholders, Patriarchs and Moses, Nabobs, Squires, and all hell, wake up, or the institution of slavery is lost—the divine privilege of kidnapping is no more." The South complains, and justly, that she has been deceived by the syren strains of her Northern Genii. You told us, says she, there was no danger; that abolitionists were but a handful of despised fanatics, destined in a few short years to disorganise and be

forgotten ; but such is their number and influence, that we shall demand protection from them by altering the constitution of our country, or we shall dissolve the Union. The subject of slavery *shall not be discussed*. Vain strife ! Say, valorous South, wilt chain forked lightnings, or fetter careering winds,—check gravitation or hurl the planets from their spheres ! Sooner attempt this, than hope to pinion free thought or arrest the progress of abolition. Abolitionists may be mobbed, routed, murdered, but their principles are undying and indestructible. Truth will prevail, and slavery shall be destroyed. Natural freedom and equal rights are the legacies of Heaven, and invested like their divine Giver with the attributes of omnipotence and immutability. They are assailable and may seem capable of receiving harm, but they stand unhurt, firm and unmoved as the everlasting hills, a wall of adamant. Let every tyrant remember that he is striving in a contest with infinite odds against him.

Christians of the North, I appeal to you in behalf of my down-trodden, depressed brethren. I ask nothing for the American Anti-Slavery Society, but a candid examination of its principles,—these are true, fundamentally true. They are truth, adamantinè truth itself, and the “superstructure,” built thereupon by abolitionists, will, “must” withstand all the storms of obloquy and all the waves of opposition, which the enemies of God and man are able to pour upon it. Christians, “American Christians,” will you build upon these principles ? Will you submit to the teachings of everlasting truth—to the voice of nature and the monitions of conscience, and aid in setting the captive free ? Dream ye of the “annihilation of the society ?” First check the wheels of nature, and annihilate duration ! Are its “principles fallacious ?” So are the elements of truth ! Is the “American Anti-Slavery Society evil, politically, socially, and morally ?” So then are the ten commandments, the moral law, the Declaration of our Independence, and the Constitution of our country ! So also are freedom of Speech, and Liberty of the Press ! Will the principles of the society “legitimately acted out, result in hardening the hearts of slaveholders, and riveting the chains of slavery—in leading on to deeds of violence,” and in all the black catalogue which my ill-boding opponent apprehends ? Then indeed am I almost forced to cry out with the archfiend,

———“Hail horrors, hail
Infernal world, and thou profoundest hell.”

But these evils and results exist only in the distempered imagination of a man at no time distinguished for coolness, and never remarkable for penetration or sagacity. Upon all assaults hitherto made against the American Anti-Slavery Society, God has manifestly set the seal of his disapprobation, and I would humbly, yet earnestly admonish “American Christians,” by all the love they bear to the bodies and souls of their fellow men, by their philanthropy, their patriotism, their religion—by the love of Christ, and the interests of bleeding humanity, to pause ere they imbibe the spirit, or follow the suggestion of a “Citizen of New York,”—to be slow in deciding “against” the American Anti-Slavery Society, lest peradventure they be found fighting against God.

HUMBUGS DISSECTED.

AFTER the foregoing treatise had gone to press, a book entitled "Humbugs of New-York, by Dr. Reese," made its appearance. This book contains nine chapters, the first introductory to the work, the remaining eight having each for its theme what the author terms a humbug. He commences with Animal Magnetism, and after a flourish or so falls foul of Phrenology, thence he lights upon the Homœopathic practice of medicine, and by easy transition is found among "quackery in general." Ultra-Temperance, Ultra-Protestantism, and Ultra-Sectarianism alike share his vengeance and his frown.

Of the merits or demerits of these topics I have nothing at present to say.

In relation to the treatment of them by my opponent, the author, I have simply to remark, that some men introduce the faults or foibles of others for sake of illustration or argument, but Dr. Reese lugs them in by wholesale with obvious zest, and for the sole purpose of banqueting upon them.—*Mordax culparum.*

Among other things which he calls "*Humbugs*," the American Anti-Slavery Society is classed, by the imposing title of "*ultra-abolitionism*." In this part of the work—and it is the only part of the book that specially concerns me, my antagonist worries himself in pretty much the same style that he does in the pages which I have just criticised. My limits will not admit any thing like a minute examination of this new, or rather old effusion newly vented, and I must therefore content myself with touching a *few* only of his main positions, and referring to the preceding pages of this pamphlet for a more complete refutation. Indeed the two productions are—like Pharaoh's dreams—one. The same assumptions, same style, same thoughts, and in many instances the same words characterise and mark both. I think however my friend progresses in the use of billingsgate, and in the art of slandering. This last emanation caps the climax, and out-Reeses even the Doctor himself. But I shall not in imitation of my antagonist spend my time in empty declamation, but proceed to examine in as few words as possible the *great* work before me.

The Doctor here, as in the Appeal, states that abolitionists teach that "Slavery is *malum per se*—a sin against God in all circumstances,"—and this proposition he pronounces untrue, and declares that if he can adduce a single case in which slaveholding is not sinful, then the whole fabric of the A. A. S. Society must crumble to atoms!

To execute his task he lays down this general proposition, viz. "No action can be justly decided to be either *malum* or *bonum per se*:" which he says is learned from the Bible.

Now if I can adduce *one* instance of an action that can be justly decided to be *malum* or *bonum per se*, then will the whole fabric of my opponent's reasoning fall to the dust.—"The question of right and wrong," says my oracular opponent, "is adjudicated by the Divine law *universally in connection with its circumstances*, and not abstractly. For example, Thou shalt not kill, (for want of room I must omit the most of this quotation, which the reader will find on the 145th and 146th page: of the *Humbug*), is imperative and unqualified, and yet was never designed to prohibit killing independent of *circumstances*."

I suppose not. It would be hard to kill without some circumstance I throw! Killing was done by Divine authority, says my opponent; and after giving several examples he observes: "These were all *killing*, and according to the creed of ultraism flagrant violations of the commandment," &c.

"Let us," says he, "illustrate our position. A man is killed, and an ultra affirms forthwith that the man who did the deed is guilty of murder, for killing is *malum per se*."

No abolitionist will affirm that *KILLING* is *malum per se*. His affirmation will be that *MURDER* is *malum per se*, at all times and in all places.

My opponent states that the "act of *killing*" is the same in murder, manslaughter, justifiable homicide or casualty, and therefore decides, that independent of circumstances the moral quality of the act cannot be estimated. But this is a very indefinite mode of reasoning. Independent of circumstances there can be no "*killing*" of any sort. But he is wrong in saying that the external act of killing is the same in these different cases—the act is *similar* but not the *same*, and this distinction is important, and will settle the question that the act of murder is always murder, of homicide always homicide, of manslaughter always manslaughter, *independent of circumstances*. And so of the guilt or venialness of the act. Murder is always wrong in all circumstances, justifiable homicide is always right in all circumstances.

Now apply this principle to the doctrine of abolitionists that slaveholding is sinful in all circumstances, and there will be no difficulty in perceiving its truth and the fallacy of my opponent's reasoning.

He asserts that in *certain circumstances*, slaveholding is proper. Why? because he supposes that the character of slavery is changed by a modification of circumstances. If he will reflect that *slaveholding is always slaveholding*, in all circumstances, he will perceive, if he have common sense, that the proposition of abolitionists is true. If the circumstances are such as to change the moral quality of the act, then it is not *slaveholding* but something else, something *similar*, it may be in the outer act, but not the *same* act, as I have shown.

I have stated that if I can adduce one instance of an action that is "*malum or bonum per se*," I will have destroyed the whole foundation and superstructure of the Doctor's argument.

If I have not shown that murder is an evil of itself—intrinsically wrong—sinful under all circumstances, because a violation of the sixth commandment, I will venture to assert that profane cursing and swearing is a *sin* which no possible circumstances can modify, and no sophistry palliate, excuse or justify. Under what circumstance will the taking of God's name *in vain* be justifiable? I pause for a reply!

But indeed the spirit of this commandment is embodied in its language. The words "*in vain*" set *circumstances* at defiance: and so also do correct *definitions* of actions. Now if Dr. Reese had only troubled himself to ascertain what slavery *is*, he would not have run into such rampant nonsense and such glaring absurdities.

My opponent, after his old fashion, attempts to justify slavery from the Bible under four heads: and to show what a profound expositor of the Scriptures he is, refers his readers to the tenth commandment as a convincing proof that God made and sanctions slavery; in answer to all which I would refer my obsolete opponent for his instruction, to Weld's Bible Argument, recently published, hoping that he will improve by it at least so far as to get on a new track and strike out a new course for his future attacks. It is somewhat laughable to witness the puissant and most deadly attacks of my antagonist, in a strain, a spirit, in form and matter precisely the same, except a natural increase of virulence from year to year, ever since the foundation of the A. A. S. Society. If the goat would read their publications, he would not display such palpable ignorance of their proceedings, nor expose

his weakness in attempting to overthrow their principles. He is at least five years behind the times.

The Doctor now reaches the spot in which he proposes to show that "the act of holding property in man is not *malum per se*," &c. He supposes in the first place, the case of an *idiot-holder*, with which I have nothing to do; my business is with the *slaveholder*. Again he supposes a case wherein the laws of the land interfere, and the slaveholder's conscience will not suffer him to sell his slaves to any one else for fear they may be ill-treated.—What a charitable man! This slaveholder cannot believe another can be as humane as himself! See page 8.

My Biblical opponent brings a heavy charge against abolitionists, in asserting that the doctrine of slavery being sinful is nowhere found in the Bible. I will not stop to argue that point with him, but suffer him to answer himself. He says,

"1st. The doctrine that slavery is a sin, independent of all circumstances, &c., is not found even by implication in the Bible." It is "derived from the TEXT, 'all men are born free and equal,' " which TEXT my *patriotic* opponent informs us is merely an "ad captandum flourish," and declares that those who promulgated it, neither "taught nor implied a denial of the right of property in man."

On the other side he says, 2dly, "That Slavery is an evil, however, can be proved from the Bible," &c.

Thus he proceeds contradicting himself, sometimes on one side and sometimes the other; at one time justifying slavery, and anon declaring it to be an evil, &c. &c.

Now, he inquires what is sin, in order to ascertain whether Slavery is sin. But he cannot find a definition to suit slavery in the Bible. I suppose he has forgotten the eighth commandment.

He finally, after bobbing about through the whole Scriptures, and becoming as one would think very much enlightened, makes the following very extraordinary assertion. "Nor can we find throughout the entire Bible a single example in which sin is defined independent of circumstances, or duty enjoined without regard to consequences."

The only definition of sin to which I can immediately refer, is 1 John iii. 4: "For sin is the transgression of the law." Here is a definition as independent of circumstances as any one can be.

For "duty enjoined without regard to consequences," I would refer my intelligent opponent to the command given to Abraham to leave his native country, &c., and in another instance to offer up his son Isaac. We are told "he went out not knowing whither he went."

My amplifying opponent takes a sweep of some 20 or 30 pages, which he devotes exclusively to the most wanton and unprovoked aspersion of haracter; misrepresentation of motives, aims and actions; perversion of reason, Scripture, and common sense; misstatements of facts and arguments; false charges and allegations; indeed, if the whole "anti-slavery vocabulary," and all other vocabularies were ransacked for epithets, and the aggregate mass showered on the head of Rev. D. M. Reese, they would fail to express half the turpitude, the deep, loathing turpitude, and infamous scandal, portrayed in his attempt to blacken and blackguard down one of the best associations in our land, and many of our best and most worthy citizens.

He at length hits upon an illustration of abolition mob raising, by the "strong parallel (?) and striking analogy," as he says, of a street preacher, and seems to felicitate himself upon the happy expedient he has chosen to bombard the practice and doings of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Suppose, he inquires, this street preacher produces "outbreakings of popular violence, would not all the good men pause—and adopt some other course?" I answer, perhaps they might, and perhaps not. Paul was a street and "mar-

ket" house preacher. His preaching was the occasion of tumults and uproars among the people; and he was "lynched" for it. But he preached on in the same manner wherever he found opportunity. The "parallel" therefore, "*strong*" as it is, won't do; and the analogy, however "*striking*," can never strike the perceptions of a man of sense.

Having settled the case of mob raising, my exquisite opponent plunges again into billingsgate and revels in his native mire. He denies that abolitionists pursue "peaceable measures," or that "prayer and the diffusion of light are the only means which they authorize." He says they abuse the liberty of the press, disturb the peace of community and excite tumults and violence; he again repeats the falsehood, which he promulgated four years ago, and has reiterated a thousand times since, about the Society "amalgamating the races," at the Chapel at one of the anniversaries. (See p. 17.)

I would advise Dr. Reese to say less hereafter about amalgamation, at least not to be too severe in remarks, or even hints, which may seem to imply a violation of good order and sound *virtue*. Why does he hazard "the revilings of the whole kennel press, conducted by black or white abolitionists" as he very *respectfully* expresses it? Why does he, knowing his own character to be any thing else than beyond suspicion, why does he tempt chastisement? Is it to court popularity, to gain notoriety at whatever expense? Alas for his fair fame, that he should be beleaguered and "used up" by a subaltern in the anti-slavery ranks when his object is to "*decapitate*" the "giants" and win laurels in mortal combat with the chiefs.

I have only room to remark that my veracious opponent declares that the right of petition has *not* been denied in Congress. In relation to the Alton affair he makes out Lovejoy to be worse than a murderer, and three or four times repeats the falsehood that Mr. L. shot Bishop, and strives to make out the whole affair to be merely a "*humbug*." But he says, "by far the vilest *humbug*" was the attempt "to canonize Mr. L." at the Tabernacle, &c., while poor Bishop whom L. killed wasn't thought of. It will be perceived that my opponent's mind runs very much like that of the Jews, they cried out, not this man but Barabbas, and he shouts not Lovejoy but Bishop. They went the whole against street preaching or holders forth in the market places, and he goes the whole against street preaching, without knowing why.

If Dr. Reese had heretofore sustained the character of a man of respectability and veracity, the manner in which he here treats the Alton murder, is sufficient to stamp upon him the indelible mark of infamy. I have no space to particularize and must pass on.

On page 208 of the "*humbug*" may be found another lie repeated annually if not monthly or daily since the formation of the A. A. S. Society, viz., "No slave has been, or (mark the language) ever will be, emancipated by its instrumentality:" that is of the A. A. S. Society. (See page 13.)

Thus I have noticed, though briefly, the principal points in this chapter of "*humbugs*." Perhaps I have bestowed more pains on them than they deserve, for surely never before have I seen such an execrable combination of vileness: and were it not that I desire to thwart its object and neutralize its effects, I would not touch it with a ten feet pole. I trust, however, as I have before stated, that I may not again have occasion to be employed in a like unpleasant task. I feel confident that my antagonist will cry lustily for quarter, and quarter shall only be granted him upon condition that he cease to malign the A. A. S. Society.

I have reflected upon the propriety of taking up the "*humbug*," and criticising the whole of it faithfully, and as it deserves, if it deserve criticising at all, or merits any notice. Whether I shall do so or not will depend upon "*circumstances*." In glancing over the book hastily, I observe that the author is prodigiously careless in his propositions, his premises, his

assertions, his "non sequiturs," and conclusions. If, for instance, Animal Magnetism be a "humbug," as he asserts, there is no proof of it in our author's book, any more than there is proof that geometry is a humbug. In fact Dr. Reese could hardly add to the flagrancy of his own humbuggery should he attempt to show that Mathematics, Natural Philosophy and History were all "*humbugs*." He appears endowed with humbug instinct; has an ample share of the hum, but more by far of the *bug*. He is, of all humbugs yet imposed upon the good citizens of Gotham, the greatest "beyond compare."

The weakness of my eyes however may deter me from the undertaking; and I may take occasion here to state that this infirmity must be my apology for any imperfection in this review. I am admonished that of making many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness to the flesh, but when duty calls me to the work I must obey.

I intended to close my remarks upon "*Humbugs*" by giving a general criticism, but I have already proceeded beyond the ordinary limits of a pamphlet, and must content myself with a very few, out of many points that I purposed to notice.

First. The style of the author is boisterous, roystering and vulgar, round and bellowing, closely allied to pot-house diction, and admirably suited to win the favor of alehouse readers. In short, to use his own classical phrase, it is itself the argument "*ad captandum*," *ignobile vulgus*.

Second. His mode of reasoning, if that may be called reasoning which is a perversion of reason, is puerile, contemptible, pedantic, absurd and often ludicrous. He is for ever talking about propositions, premises, deductions, "non sequiturs," "*et id omnegenus*," while he don't appear to have learned the elements of logic.

Thirdly. The moral character of the author as deduced from these publications is questionable. He professes indeed to be on the side of virtue, but does he pursue the course of an honest upright man? Is his object to investigate truth? Is it not rather to gain a point right or wrong? Let his version of the Alton murder answer! The reader of "*humbugs*" cannot fail to perceive that the author is constantly on tiptoe, stilting along and reaching out after something more, and yet more, to set off his performance. He colors facts until they lose their *recognisance*. If imperfections or faults exist in a society or individual obnoxious to his ban, he fails not to search them out even to the minutest, and in giving them publicity, so amplifies and exaggerates as to make mountains of mole-hills. It seems to be his delight, as it is his *forte*, to assail character and worth—to asperse and malign and blacken purity. So,

"Back wounding calumny the whitest virtue strikes."

I have no hesitation in asserting that if the "*humbug*" and "appeal" were stripped of declamation and rant there would not be enough left to tell the running title. If indeed a sentence now and then occur in which exaggeration or perversion does not constitute a part, it is quickly followed by an overwhelming torrent of slang that leaves not a trace behind. The exaggerated statements, false coloring and turgid, inflated style of my opponent, may be set down to natural infirmity—a too great development of sundry *bumps*; but mis-statements and false statements are too strong evidences of moral obliquity to be passed by unceasured.

But I must stop just at the commencement—make my bow and retire. Fellow citizens, who have followed me through these pages, I appeal to your judgment and sagacity whether "David Meredith Reese, M. D." is not the greatest *humBUG* in the city of New-York.